



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,955	11/16/2001	Alok K. Saxena	65187-209	7880

22504 7590 06/08/2005

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

EXAMINER

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,955

Applicant(s)

SAXENA ET AL.

Examiner

Nghi V. Tran

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 28 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

RS

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: "cal" appears to be a typo error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner cannot find a proper support "to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header" in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2151

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-25, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,700,888 (hereinafter Jonsson), in view of Barrany et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0064164 (hereinafter Barrany).

6. With respect to claims 1, 7, 9, 17, and 25, Jonsson teaches a call context processor [figure 1], comprising:

- a header extractor [22] configured to extract a header from information [28] extracted from initial call establishment negotiation [col.4, ln.5-19];
- a header compressor [18 i.e. Header Compression Node] configured to compress relevant portions of the extracted header [col.4, ln.1-4 and col.4, lns.21-39]; and
- an identification module configured to establish context identification using the compressed relevant portions of the header [col.1, ln.58 - col.2, ln.25].

However, Jonsson is silent on the header compressor configured to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header.

In a call context processor, Barany discloses a header compressor configured to discard irrelevant portions of the extracted header [404 i.e. remove RTP/UDP/IP headers].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Barany by discarding

Art Unit: 2151

irrelevant portions of the extracted header because this feature enhances a spectral efficiency of bandwidth [Barany, paragraphs 0008&0029]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Barany in order to avoid a reduction of the spectral efficiency of the air interface [Barany, paragraphs 0008&0029].

7. With respect to claims 2, 10, and 18, Jonsson is silent on the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a call context processor, Barany discloses the identification module associates the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation [fig.3 and paragraphs 0068-0071].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Barany by associating the context identification with a bearer channel of a call established from the initial call establishment negotiation because this feature enhances a spectral efficiency of bandwidth [Barany, paragraphs 0008&0029]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Barany in order to remove RTP/UDP/IP header information so that only bearer data is communicated across the air interface to the radio network controller [Barany, paragraph 0067].

Art Unit: 2151

8. With respect to claims 5, 13, and 21, Jonsson further teaches the header being an RTP, UDP, IP header [col.1, Ins.13-34].

9. With respect to claims 6, 16, 24, and 28, Jonsson is silent on the call context processor extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation.

In a call context processor, Barany discloses the call context processor extracts information by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation [fig.3].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Jonsson in view of Barany by processing a create connection message and an associated session data protocol header from the initial call establishment negotiation because this feature enhances a spectral efficiency of bandwidth [Barany, paragraphs 0008&0029]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Jonsson in view of Barany in order to remove RTP/UDP/IP header information so that only bearer data is communicated across the air interface to the radio network controller [Barany, paragraph 0067].

10. With respect to claims 14 and 22, Jonsson further teaches extracting information from initial call establishment negotiation, and establishing the context identification are performed at a base of a transmission network [col.3, ln.33 - col.4, ln.30]

Art Unit: 2151

11. With respect to claims 8, 15, and 23, Jonsson further teaches a remote unit accesses the base via airlink [col.3, lns.40-52].

12. Claims 3-4, 11-12, 19-20, 26-27, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson and Barrany as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Galyas et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,879,599 (hereinafter Galyas).

13. With respect to claims 3-4, 11-12, 19-20, 26-27, and 29-31, Jonsson is silent on the header compressor compresses only a payload type header field.

In a call context processor, Galyas discloses the header compressor compresses only a payload type header field [col.5, lns.51-59 i.e. only the compressed speech/data (payload) which does not compress the irrelevant portions of the extracted header].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Jonsson and Barrany, and further in view of Galyas by compressing only a payload type header field because this feature improves the bandwidth and power efficiency of the link. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Jonsson and Barrany, and further in view of Galyas, in order to save transmission capacity throughout the network without any additional bandwidth [Stumpert, col.2, lns.65-66].

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. "Method and apparatus for providing real-time packetized voice and data services over a wireless communication network," by Leung, U.S. Patent No. 6,879,581.

b. "Method and apparatus for packet transmission with header compression," by Yoshimura et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0048680.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2151

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi V Tran
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151

NT


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER